

V. REMARKS

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; c) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an Appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. The amendments to the subject claims do not incorporate any new subject matter into the claims. Thus, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. By canceling claim 10, the rejection is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Ozaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031658). However, claims 7 and 8 have been canceled in the Amendment that was filed on February 14, 2006. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Ozaki. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ozaki discloses a pattern display device that includes a pattern display and a front side display. The pattern display unit has a display portion for displaying a plurality of different first patterns. The pattern display unit is capable of performing a stationary display and a varying display. The front side display unit is disposed in front of the pattern display unit and is capable of displaying a plurality of different second patterns overlapping with the plurality of first patterns. The front side display unit is transparent except for the plurality of second patterns.

With regard to claim 4, the Office Action states that claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Both claims 1 and 4 are amended by adding the features of claim 10 as mentioned above. As a result, both claims 1 and 4, as amended, are allowable.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claims 5, 6 and 11 depend from claim 4 and include all of the features of claim 4. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 4 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozaki and Biferno (U.S. Patent No. 4,562,433) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,199). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Biferno discloses a display system that is constructed in such a manner that, upon failure of the primary display fabricated from a liquid crystal display, the primary display becomes transparent upon its failure and a backup display located behind the primary display becomes visible to a user.

Suzuki teaches a liquid crystal display device. The Examiner cites this reference to show a liquid crystal display with an antistatic treatment.

Claim 9 depends from claim 4 and includes all of the features of claim 4. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is allowable at least for the reason claim 4 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims

not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Carl Schaukowitch  
Reg. No. 29,211

Date: June 30, 2006

**RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC**  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 955-3750  
Fax: (202) 955-3751  
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s):      Amendment Transmittal

DC239840.DOC